

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The specification has been conformed to correspond to the preferred format for U.S. patent applications as required in the Office Action, and a Substitute Specification and Comparison Copy are submitted herewith.

Claims 3-5, 8-9 and 11-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1-2, 6-7 and 10 have been canceled.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indicated allowability of claims 4 and 10.

New independent apparatus claim 13 is a combination of original claim 1 and a first portion of now-cancelled original claim 2.

New independent apparatus claim 14 is a combination of original claim 1 and a second portion of original claim 2.

New independent apparatus claim 15 is a combination of original claim 1 and a third portion of original claim 2.

New independent apparatus claim 16 replaces dependent claim 6 (cancelled) and is directed to a weaving mill comprising a plurality of weaving machines and travelling clearers.

New independent method claim 17 is a combination of original claims 7 and 10 (cancelled).

New independent method claim 18 is directed to operating a weaving mill having a plurality of weaving machines and a travelling clearer for removing contaminants from the weaving machines.

Claim 6 was objected to because it recites the possible use of the weaving machine in a weaving mill. Claim 6 has been cancelled and replaced by new independent claim 16, which is directed to a weaving mill.

Most claims, including original independent claims 1 and 7 (now cancelled), were rejected for anticipation by Cooper (6,006, 790). Applicant notes, however, that claims directed

to formation of a substantially horizontal compressed air flow, such as original claims 4 and 10, were found patentable over Cooper.

New independent apparatus claim 13, which combines claim 1 with portions of claim 2 (now cancelled), requires, amongst others, that the nozzles be “arranged to produce a substantially horizontal compressed air flow transverse to a direction of travel of the ground and leno threads in a region between the ground and leno threads”. Cooper has no corresponding disclosure as, indeed, was recognized by allowing original claim 4. Thus, claim 13 is not anticipated by Cooper.

New independent apparatus claim 16 closely tracks claim 13 discussed above but differs therefrom by being directed to a weaving mill using a plurality of weaving machines. The weaving machines themselves are defined in the same manner as they are defined in claim 13 discussed above.

Claim 16 is therefore not anticipated by Cooper for the same reasons why claim 13 is not anticipated by it, i.e. because the claim requires the air flow to be substantially horizontal and transverse to the direction of travel of the ground and leno threads.

New independent apparatus claim 14 is a combination of original claim 1 and a second portion of original claim 2 and requires, amongst others, “at least one of the nozzles being arranged between a reed and the leno thread guide elements for generating a compressed air flow directed downwardly through the shed from above”.

Cooper has no disclosure whatsoever to arrange a nozzle between the reed and the leno thread guide elements. For at least this reason, claim 14 is not anticipated by Cooper.

Claim 14 further requires that the compressed air flow is directed downwardly through the shed from above. Cooper contains no suggestion to direct the air flows downwardly. For at least this further reason, Cooper does not anticipate claim 14.

New independent apparatus claim 15 is a combination of original claim 1 and a third portion of original claim 2. Claim 18 recites, amongst others, that the cleaning apparatus

has at least one nozzle “arranged in a lower region of the leno elements for directing a compressed air flow towards the leno elements”.

Claim 15 differs from Cooper in that the claim requires at least one nozzle be arranged in the lower region of the leno elements for directing a compressed air flow towards the leno elements. Cooper discloses a suction manifold 40, 88 located below the first part of the shed. Leno elements are not described in Cooper, but if they were present, they would have to be arranged in the second part of the shed near the beater assembly 82, 84 or reed. Cooper discloses to place the suction manifold 42, 90 arranged in the second part of the shed above where the leno elements would be. For at least this reason, Cooper does not anticipate claim 15.

Further, Cooper does not disclose the use of any nozzles that blow compressed air. A suction manifold as disclosed by Cooper would not be able to direct a compressed air flow towards the leno elements even if the manifold were closer to the leno elements. For at least this further reason, Cooper does not anticipate claim 15.

New independent method claim 17 is substantively similar to new claim 13 but employs method terminology. It recites, amongst others, “generating a substantially horizontal compressed air flow which is transverse to a direction of travel of the ground and leno threads in a region between the ground and leno threads”, which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Cooper, and which led to the allowance of original claims 4 and 10.

Thus, claim 17 is not anticipated by Cooper.

New independent method claim 18 is directed to operating a weaving mill having a plurality of weaving machines. Claim 18 is otherwise substantially identical to independent method claim 17, except that claim 18 additionally requires a travelling clearer, and is not anticipated by Cooper for the same reasons why claim 17 is not anticipated by it.

The remaining dependent claims 3, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are directed to specific features of the present invention which are independently patentable. These claims are further allowable because they depend from allowable parent claims.

Application No. 10/674,574
Amendment
Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2005


PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a formal notification to that effect at an early date is requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (415) 273-4730 (direct dial).

Respectfully submitted,


J. Georg Seka
Reg. No. 24,491

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: (415) 576-0200
Fax: (415) 576-0300
JGS:jhw
60622223 v1